



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,639	07/01/2003	Jin Li	MS305346.1 / MSFTP483US	1386
27195	7590	12/02/2008		
AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP				
127 Public Square				
57th Floor, Key Tower				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER				
KENDALL, CHUCK O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/02/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/611,639

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

CHUCK O. KENDALL

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/08/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This is in response to application filed 08/06/08.
2. Claims 1 – 29 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 - 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Beaumont et al. US 2004/0073511 A1 in view of Burke 5,423,041.

Regarding claims 1, 21 – 26, Beaumont discloses a system facilitating rule composition comprising:

a rule composer that in response to a user input facilitates at least one of creation and modification of a rule, the rule composer further receiving

information associated with the at least one of creation and modification of the rule based, and a display component that displays hierarchical information associated with the rule [0045 – 0046 see modify rules, or create rules, also see paragraph 0046, for building blocks of rules and tree hierarchy]

Beaumont doesn't expressly disclose wherein the rule base is at least in part, upon natural language inline editing.

However, Burke in an analogous art and similar configuration of composing rules in an object oriented language environment discloses creating and modification of class instances as well as user defined classes and rule sequences for a particular language (1:55 - 2: 15).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beaumont and Burke, because it would enable devising a rule set for a particular object oriented language as suggested by Burke above.

Regarding claim 2, the system of claim 1, further comprising an input component that facilitates receipt of information associated with the at least one of creation and modification of the rule [Beaumont 0015] also see Burke FIG. 2.

Regarding claim 3, the system of claim 1, the rule being a business rule [0051].

Regarding claim 4, the system of claim 1, the rule being based, at least in part, upon a parameterized format string definition [0050, see configure, and code packets].

Regarding claim 5, the system of claim 1, the rule being based, at least in part, upon a composable vocabulary definition [0028, see additional definition or rule].

Regarding claim 6, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating a user interface comprising a first splitting panel and a second splitting panel [0028, see display].

Regarding claims 7 and 27, the system of claim 6, wherein the first splitting panel facilitates building a condition associated with the rule [0028].

Regarding claim 8, the system of claim 6, wherein the second splitting panel facilitates building an action associated with the rule [0028, see first

and second list].

Regarding claim 9, the system of claim 1, wherein editing focus can be transferred from a node associated with the node visually accentuated to represent a parent-child relationship [0046, see tree and hierarchy].

Regarding claim 10, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating a user interface comprising a property window that displays a property of a node of the hierarchical information [0046].

Regarding claim 11, the system of claim 1, the rule comprising a condition [0011, see condition].

Regarding claim 12, the system of claim 11, the condition comprising at least one of a logical and, a logical not and a logical or [0012, see logical expression].

Regarding claim 13, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating display of a context menu associated with at least one of an action and a condition associated with the rule [0045].

Regarding claim 14, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating a user interface comprising at least one of adjust splitting panels, a drag and drop operation, and, a clipboard operation [Examiner is taking official notice on the use of copy and pasting and the use of clipboard operation as such operations are well known in the art].

Regarding claim 15, the system of claim 1 the rule composer comprising a rule editor and a policy explorer [0045].

Regarding claim 16, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating editing of a parameter having a range [0045].

Regarding claim 17, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating editing of an unconstrained parameter [0045].

Regarding claim 18, the system of claim 1, the rule composer facilitating editing of a parameter having a value in a set of values [0045 and 0058].

Regarding claim 19, the system of claim 1, the rule composer facilitating type compatibility checking [0058, see simulation as interpreted].

Regarding claim 20, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating error checking and providing error information to the display component if an error is found [0045-0046].

Regarding claim 28, the user interface of claim 26, the rule editor region comprising an action region that displays information associated with an action associated with the rule [0045-0058].

Regarding claim 29, the user interface of claim 26, further comprising a property condition region that displays information associated with a property of a node of the hierarchical information associated with the policy [0045-0059].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached between Monday and Thursday, at 11:00 am - 4:300pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chuck O Kendall/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2192

